| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | Γ |
|------------------------------|---|
| DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS | |

| RECEIPT # 58934 |
|-----------------|
| AMOUNT & 157 |
| SUMMONS ISSUED |
| OCAL RULE 4.1 |
| VAIVER FORM |
| MCF ISSUED |
| BY DPTY, CLK |
| DATE 8-26-69 |

PHYLLIS YACHIMSKI, Plaintiff

V.

PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA & VISTING NURSE ASSOCIATION OF BOSTON, INC. GROUP LONG TERM DISABILITY PLAN,

CIVIL ACTION NO.

Defendants

04

COMPLAINT

MAGISTRATE JUDGE

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff, Phyllis Yachimski ("Ms. Yachimski"), brings this action against Defendants, Prudential Life Insurance Company of America ("Prudential") and Visiting Nurse Association of Boston, Inc. Group Long Term Disability Plan ("Plan") (collectively referred to as "Defendants") for violation of the Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §§ 1001 et. seq. ("ERISA"). Ms. Yachimski is a participant in an ERISA welfare benefit plan that is underwritten and insured by Prudential. The name of the welfare benefit plan is the Visiting Nurse Association of Boston, Inc. Group Long Term Disability Plan. The policy number is 22768.

- 2. This Complaint challenges: (1) the Defendants unreasonable and unlawful termination of Ms. Yachimski's Long Term Disability ("LTD") benefits without appropriate justification and without granting her a full and fair review of her claim for benefits; (2) Prudential's pattern of rejecting and/or ignoring the substantial evidence supporting Ms. Yachimski's total disability pursuant to the terms of the Plan; and (3) Prudential's failure to provide a reasonable claims procedure that would yield a decision on the merits of Ms. Yachimski's claim.
- 3. Ms. Yachimski is filing this action to recover benefits due under the Plan, to enforce the present rights existing therein, to clarify rights under the terms of the Plan, and to recover costs and attorneys' fees as provided by ERISA.

JURISDICTION

4. This court has personal and subject matter jurisdiction over this case under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e)(2) and (f), without regard to jurisdictional amount or diversity of citizenship, in that the Plan is administered in this district.

PARTIES

- 5. Ms. Yachimski is a 63 year old woman who currently resides in Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts. Ms. Yachimski is a vested participant in a Prudential employee benefit plan, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 1002(2)(7). Ms. Yachimski has standing to bring this action under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a).
- 6. Prudential Life Insurance Company of America ("Prudential") is a for-profit corporation with its principal place of business at 751 Broad Street, Newark, New Jersey, 07102-3777. Prudential transacts business in Massachusetts and insures and underwrites the Plan under which Ms. Yachimski is suing. Prudential is the

- party responsible for processing claims made under the Plan and making a final determination as to Plan participants' eligibility for LTD benefits.
- 7. At all times relevant to the claims asserted in this Complaint, Prudential purported to act as an ERISA claims fiduciary with respect to participants of the Plan, generally, and specifically, with respect to Ms. Yachimski, within the meaning of ERISA.
- 8. The Plan under which Ms. Yachimski is suing is a "long term disability plan" issued by Prudential and maintained continuously thereafter by Prudential. The Group Policy Number is 22768.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Insurance Entitlement, Definitions of Disability, Discretion

- Ms. Yachimski was a Registered Nurse who became disabled in June 1994, while working as a home health nurse at Visiting Nurse Association of Boston ("VNA").
- 10. Prudential both funds and administers the Plan under which Ms. Yachimski is suing.
- 11. The Plan does not contain any provisions giving independent and final discretion to Prudential to determine eligibility for benefits or to interpret the terms of the Plan.
- 12. The Plan provides for the payment of LTD benefits when an insured person becomes totally disabled. Total Disability is defined under the terms of the Plan in the following manner:

Total Disability" exists when Prudential determines that all of these conditions are met:

(1) Due to Sickness or accidental injury, both of these are true:

- a. You are not able to perform, for wage or profit, the material and substantial duties of your occupation.
- b. After the Initial Duration of a period of Total Disability, you are not able to perform for wage or profit, the material and substantial duties of any job for which you are reasonably fitted by your education, training or experience.
- (2) You are not working at any job for wage or profit.
- (3) You are under the regular care of a doctor.
- 13. The Plan defines the "Initial Duration" as the "Elimination Period plus the period extending to your attainment of age 65."
- 14. The Plan defines the "Elimination Period" as follows:
 For each period of Total Disability due to Sickness or accidental injury, the first 13 weeks of continuous Total Disability.
- 15. The Maximum Benefit Duration for Ms. Yachimski, based upon her age at the date of the onset of her disability, is to her normal retirement age, but not less than sixty months.
- 16. Nowhere in the Plan is the term "your occupation" defined.

Ms. Yachimski's Claim for LTD Benefits

17. Ms. Yachimski has presented a timely claim to Prudential, asserting that she is an insured person, that she became totally disabled while insured, and that she is entitled under the Plan to LTD benefits for the period of time beginning on September 1, 2001, when Prudential wrongfully terminated her benefits, and continuing thereafter without interruption through to the present, and continuing in the future until she reaches the age of 65 or is no longer totally disabled.

Background/Onset of Illness

18. Ms. Yachimski was employed throughout her entire professional career as a Registered Nurse.

- 19. In June 1990, while working full time as a Staff Nurse at the Visiting Nurses
 Association ("VNA") of Boston, Massachusetts, Ms. Yachimski suffered a
 postereolateral myocardial infarction ("MI") and was hospitalized at Beth Israel
 Hospital ("BIH") in Boston. Ms. Yachimski's hospitalization was complicated by
 transient right heart failure, hypotension and significant iron deficiency anemia.

 During her hospitalization, a radioiodine scan confirmed that she had
 hyperthyroidism, leading to a diagnosis of Graves' disease.
- 20. Graves' disease is an autoimmune disorder in which the immune system produces antibodies that attack the thyroid gland, resulting in overproduction of thyroid hormones. In most cases, symptoms of Graves' disease include weight loss, rapid heart rate, tremor, anxiety, insomnia, and muscle weakness.
- 21. Ms. Yachimski experienced all of the symptoms of Graves' disease.
- 22. Upon her discharge from BIH, Ms. Yachimski was placed on several cardiac and thyroid medications, including inderal, isordil, propylthiouracil ("PTU") and aspirin. Ms. Yachimski's Graves' disease was very difficult to control during this time period.
- 23. In October 1990, Ms. Yachimski began experiencing heavy, prolonged menstrual bleeding. A hysterogram performed in December 1990 showed a submucosal fibroid, and was believed to be the cause of her vaginal bleeding.
- 24. On or about February 6, 1991, Ms. Yachimski was admitted to BIH with nausea and abdominal discomfort. Ms. Yachimski subsequently underwent a hysteroscopy and hysteroscopic removal of an endometrial fibroid.

- 25. In 1992, Ms. Yachimski continued to experience serious health problems, including being diagnosed with breast cancer.
- On January 31, 1992, Ms. Yachimski had a right breast mass excised at BIH. The 26. mass was determined to be an infiltrating ductal carcinoma. On February 13, 1992, Dr. Marc S. Rubin, M.D., performed a re-excision of the mass and axillary dissection. She received post operative radiation treatment and tamoxifen therapy.
- In 1993, Ms. Yachimski's health was further compromised by gynecological 27. problems, including cervical dysplasia, ultimately requiring a surgical cervical conization with D&C.
- 28. In early 1994, Ms. Yachimski began experiencing nausea, weight loss and severe diarrhea, which ultimately led to her being diagnosed with Crohn's disease.
- 29. Crohn's disease is a chronic illness that can cause significant health problems throughout life, as it often recurs intermittently.
- 30. Dr. Gerald Smetana, M.D., Ms. Yachimski's primary care provider, placed Ms. Yachimski on 40 m.g. per day of prednisone in order to decrease the severe diarrhea and abdominal cramping associated with Crohn's disease.
- In addition to the severe abdominal symptoms Ms. Yachimski experienced during 31. that time, she also developed significant back pain, which was subsequently diagnosed as sacroileitis, which is often attributed to Crohn's disease.
- 32. It was during this time that Dr. Smetana noted that Ms. Yachimski was disabled due primarily to the debilitating symptoms associated with her Crohn's disease.

- 33. Ms. Yachimski's severe abdominal symptoms continued throughout 1995, prompting Dr. Smetana to refer Ms. Yachimski to Dr. Stevens, a gastroenterologist, for a colonoscopy to rule out other possible causes of her severe diarrhea, cramping and nausea.
- 34. The colonoscopy performed in April 1995 showed Grade I Colitis and a flare up of her Crohn's disease, which according to Dr. Stevens may have been due, in part, to a decrease in her daily dose of prednisone.
- Again, during this time, Dr. Smetana reiterated his belief that due to active 35. Chrohn's Disease requiring intermittent medium to high dose steroid treatment, Ms. Yachimski was still unable to resume her work at that time. Dr. Smetana opined that Ms. Yachimski's steroid treatment had resulted in increased irritability, forgetfulness and "easy fatigability with respect to her complex intellectual tasks."
- As is often the case with Crohn's disease, Ms. Yachimski continued to experience 36. a worsening of her symptoms. Specifically, she had increased episodes of nausea and diarrhea requiring an increase in her daily prednisone dosage.
- In August 1999, Ms. Yachimski began experiencing chills, fever, sweats, chest 37. tightness and shortness of breath. She was subsequently hospitalized for pneumonia. After her discharge from the hospital she continued to have a persistent left lower lobe atelectasis (collapse), and her recovery was slow.
- In October 1999, cardiac testing showed severe mitral regurgitation and 38. ventricular dysfunction resulting in a significantly decreased Ejection Fraction

- ("EF") of only 40%, which was believed to have contributed to Ms. Yachimski's shortness of breath during exertion.
- As a result of her worsening cardiac status, Ms. Yachimski underwent cardiac 39. surgery for a mitral valve replacement on January 6, 2000. After her surgery, Ms. Yachimski's heart condition improved significantly with cardiac rehabilitation.
- Ms. Yachimski continues to experience shortness of breath and fatigue. 40.
- As a result of the symptoms of her combined illnesses, Ms. Yachimski has 41. remained unable to perform the intellectually and physically demanding tasks that staff nursing requires.

Application For and Receipt of Long-Term Disability Benefits

- Prudential determined, in 1994, that Ms. Yachimski was totally disabled effective 42. approximately June 13, 1994, as a result of the side effects of her illness and the prednisone therapy, which was being used to treat and control her Crohn's disease.
- Ms. Yachimski received LTD benefits from Prudential from December 27, 1994 43. through August 23, 2001.

Termination of Benefits

- 44. On August 23, 2001, Prudential abruptly terminated Ms. Yachimski's benefits, despite no improvement or change in her medical condition.
- Prudential's decision to terminate Ms. Yachimski's benefits was based upon a 45. review of Ms. Yachimski's records performed by Elizabeth Genovese, M.D.
- Dr. Genovese has never examined Ms. Yachimski. 46.

- 47. Dr. Genovese improperly relied primarily upon Ms. Yachimski's cardiac status as a basis for her conclusion that Ms. Yachimski is not currently disabled, and failed to address Ms. Yachimski's primary disabling symptoms as a part of her review.
- Prudential's August 30, 2001 denial was further based upon a mischaracterization 48. of Ms. Yachimski's occupation as a Nurse Supervisor as opposed to the more physically demanding occupation of a Staff Nurse.

Ms. Yachimski's Appeal of Prudential's Termination of Benefits

49. On November 19, 2001, Ms. Yachimski appealed Prudential's termination of her LTD benefits, submitting a detailed document, which included medical and vocational information supporting Ms. Yachimski's total disability pursuant to the terms of the Plan.

Second Denial Of Benefits

- On July 1, 2002, Prudential upheld its decision to terminate Ms. Yachimski's 50. benefits.
- Prudential's July 1, 2002 denial of benefits informed Ms. Yachimski that she 51. "may again appeal this decision. If you elect to do so, the appeal must be in writing."

Ms. Yachimski's Current Medical Condition

- On May 31, 2004, Ms. Yachimski suffered a stroke, which affected her ability to 52. communicate and to read.
- Ms. Yachimski continues to be disabled as a result of the debilitating side effects 53. of combined medical conditions.

- 54. Ms. Yachimski has been continuously unable to perform the material and substantial duties of her own occupation as a Staff Nurse since 1994.
- 55. Prudential failed to independently consider Ms. Yachimski's medical records and the opinions of her treating physicians in reaching its final decision to deny her claim.
- 56. The self-serving nature of Prudential's decision that Ms. Yachimski is no longer disabled is illuminated by the fact that Ms. Yachimski's condition has not changed since Prudential first accepted liability on her claim for benefits, seven years before the date it terminated Ms. Yachimski's benefits.
- 57. The decision to deny Ms. Yachimski's benefits was wrongful, unreasonable, irrational, contrary to the evidence, contrary to the terms of the Plan and contrary to law.
- Prudential's review of Ms. Yachimski's claim is further compromised by its apparent failure to review Ms. Yachimski's claim under the correct plan at various points during the appeal process.
- 59. Prudential's review of Ms. Yachimski's claim is further compromised by its failure to evaluate Ms. Yachimski's disability pursuant to Ms. Yachimski's own occupation.
- 60. Prudential was influenced by its financial conflict of interest, as both the administrator of the plan and the payor of benefits thereunder, when it denied Ms. Yachimski's benefits.

- Due to the unlawful denial of benefits under ERISA, Ms. Yachimski has lost her rightful long-term disability benefits. She has also suffered emotional distress and humiliation as a result of Prudential's actions.
- 62. Having exhausted the mandatory administrative procedures provided by Prudential, Ms. Yachimski now brings this action.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Enforcement of Terms of Plan Action for Unpaid Benefits) (ALL DEFENDANTS)

- 63. Ms. Yachimski realleges each of the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.
- 64. The Plan is a contract.
- 65. Ms. Yachimski has performed all of her obligations under the contract.
- 66. 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B) states that:

A civil action may be brought ---

- (1) by a participant or beneficiary
 - (A) for the relief provided for in subsection (c) of this section, or
 - (B) to recover benefits due to him under the terms of his plan, to enforce his rights under the terms of the plan, or to clarify his rights to future benefits under the terms of the plan.
- 67. The Defendants' actions constitute an unlawful denial of benefits under ERISA, as provided in 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B).
- 68. The Defendants unlawfully denied Ms. Yachimski's benefits in part by: (1) unreasonably rejecting the substantial evidence supporting Ms. Yachimski's total disability pursuant to the terms of the Plan; and (2) denying Ms. Yachimski a full and fair review of the decision to deny her benefits.

- 69. In accordance with 29 U.S.C. §1132, Ms. Yachimski is entitled to be paid benefits under the Plan based upon her disabled status from and after September 1, 2001, and continuing into the present.
- The Defendants have refused to provide Ms. Yachimski with these disability 70. benefits and are, therefore, in breach of the terms of the Plan and ERISA, which requires that the Defendants engage in a full and fair review of all claims and the administration of the Plan in the best interests of the Plan participants.
- As a direct and proximate result of this breach, Ms. Yachimski has lost the 71. principal and the use of her rightful LTD benefits.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Attorneys' Fees and Costs) (ALL DEFENDANTS)

- Ms. Yachimski realleges each of the paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein. 72.
- 73. Under the standards applicable to ERISA, Ms. Yachimski deserves to recover "a reasonable attorney's fee and costs of the action" herein, pursuant to section 502(g)(1) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g).
- The Defendants have the ability to satisfy the award. 74.
- 75. Ms. Yachimski's conduct of this action is in the interests of all participants suffering from physical conditions who subscribe to the Plan, and the relief granted hereunder will benefit all such participants.
- The Defendants have acted in bad faith in denying Ms. Yachimski's benefits 76. under the Plan.
- The award of attorneys' fees against the Defendants will deter others acting under 77. similar circumstances.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully prays that the Court:

- (1) Declare, adjudge and decree that Ms. Yachimski is entitled to ongoing long-term disability benefits as calculated under the terms of the Plan.
- (2) Award Ms. Yachimski the full amount of unpaid benefits under the Plan to which she is entitled, together with such pre-judgment interest as may be allowed by law.
- (3) Order that the Defendants make restitution to Ms. Yachimski in the amount of any losses sustained by Ms. Yachimski in consequence of the wrongful conduct alleged herein, together with prejudgment interest.
- (4) Award Ms. Yachimski the costs of this action and reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- (5) Award such other relief, as the court deems just and reasonable.

Dated: August 25, 2004

Respectfully submitted for the Plaintiff,

PHYLLIS YACHIMSKI

By:

Mala M. Rafik

BBO No. 638075

ROSENFELD & RAFIK, P.C.

44 School Street, Suite 410

Boston, MA 02108

617-723-7470

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

| I. (a) PLAINTIFFS | . 1 | lating the civil docket s | neet. (SEE | INSTRUCTION DEFENDA | | in September 1974, is required for th SE OF THE FORM.) | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| PHYLLIS YACHIN (b) County of Residence (E) | | PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA & VISITING NURSE ASSOCIATION OF BOSTON, INC. GROUP LONG TERM DISABILITY PLAN County of Residence of First Listed Defendant | | | | | |
| | | | | LAI | AND CONDEMNATION (ND INVOLVED. | CASES. USE THE LOCATION OF THE | |
| (c) Attomey's (Firm Na Mala M. Rafik Rosenfeld & Rafik 44 School Street, Boston, MA 0210 | k, P.C. Suite 410 | one Number) | C | Attorneys (If F | Known) | | |
| II. BASIS OF JURISI | DICTION (Place an ") | C in One Box Only | III CITI | ZENGHID ON | | ال المراجع الم | |
| ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant | X 3 Federal Questic (U.S. Gover ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Cit | | Citizen o | P | TF DEF □ 1 □ 1 Incorpor of Bus □ 2 □ 2 Incorpor | RTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaint and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF ated or Principal Place 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 | |
| | in Item III) | | Citizen o | r Subject of a [| of Bus □ 3 □ 3 Foreign 1 | siness In Another State | |
| IV. NATURE OF SUI | T (Place an "X" in | One Box Only) | Foreig | 1 Country | Toleign | Nation | |
| CONTRACT ☐ 110 Insurance | <u> </u> | ORTS | FORFE | TURE/PENALTY | Y BANKRUPTC | Y OTHER STATUTES | |
| □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property | PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal laine CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights AN "X" IN ONE BO | □ 362 Personal Injury— | 620 C 625 E 625 E 626 C 630 L 640 R 650 A 660 O S 640 C 720 La 640 C 720 La 640 C 740 Ra 740 Ra 740 C 740 | ther Food & Drug rug Related Seizure 'Property 21 USC quor Laws R. & Truck irline Regs. scupational afety Health her _ABOR ir Labor Standards t por Mgmt. Relations por Mgmt. Reporting Disclosure Act ilway Labor Act her Labor Litigation | CJ422 Appeal 28 USC 15 | 8 | |
| x 1 Original D 2 Ren | noved from □ 3 Re Court A | Remanded from Dappellate Court 4 | Ď., 1 | ☐ 5 another (specify | - 101111 | Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO The Plaintiff files this action Prudential Life Insurance Con | N (Cite the U.S. Civil State Do not cite jurisdiction under ERISA, 29 U.S. upany of America. | ate under which you are filing at statutes unless diversity.) C, §1132(a) to recover | Reopened and write brief disability be | statement of cause. | | | |
| VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: | ☐ CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P. | IS A CLASS ACTION | DEMANI | \$ | CHECK YES | only if demanded in complaint: | |
| VIII. RELATED CASE(IF ANY | | | | | JURY DEMA | ND: [] Yes No | |
| DATE 8.25.04 | | SIGNATURE OF ATTOR | NEY OF RECO | | DOCKET NUMBER | | |
| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY | | - Walay | af il | | | | |
| RECEIPT # AMO | OUN | APPLYING IFP | \underline{U} | JUDGE | MAG. | JUDGE | |

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

| 2. | | | MPANY OF AMERIC | | | | | | PRUDENTIA | | _ |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------|------------|
| | CATEG COVER | ORY IN \ | WHICH THE CASE BE (SEE LOCAL RULE | LONGS BASE 40.1(A)(1)). | ED UPON THE NUMBE | RED N | ATUR | E OF SUIT (| CODE LISTE | D ON | THE CIVIL |
| | | 1. | | | SS OF NATURE OF SU | IJТ | | | | | |
| | <u>_X</u> | If, | 195, 368, 400, 440. | 441-444 540 | 550, 555, 625, 710, 726 50, 890, 892-894, 895, 9 | | | *Also comp | lete AO 120 | or AO | 121 |
| | _ | III. | 110, 120, 130, 140, | 151, 190, 210 345, 350, 355 | 230, 240, 245, 290, 31 360, 362, 365, 370, 37 | | | ioi patein, | trademark o | r copy | right case |
| | | IV. | 220, 422, 423, 430, 4 690, 810, 861-865, 8 | 460, 510, 530, 370, 871, 875, | 610, 620, 630, 640, 650 900. | 0, 660, | | | | | |
| | _ | V. | 150, 152, 153. | | V4 | ge i | | | | | To a war |
| 3. | TITLE AI HAS BEI | | | ATED CASES. LEASE INDIC | (SEE LOCAL RULE 4 ATE THE TITLE AND N | | | | ONE PRIOR | RELA IN TH | TED CASE |
| | | | <u>N/A</u> | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | HAS A PI COURT? | RIOR AC | TION BETWEEN THE | SAME PARTI | ES AND BASED ON TH | IE SAN | IE CLA | AIM EVER B | EEN FILED | IN THI | s |
| | | | | | | YES | | NO | X | | |
| 5. | DOES TH PUBLIC I | E COMP NTERES | LAINT IN THIS CASE (F? (SEE 28 USC §24 | QUESTION TI 103) | HE CONSTITUTIONALI | TY OF | AN AC | OT OF CONC | GRESS AFF | ECTIN | G THE |
| ١ | F SO, IS | THE U.S. | A. OR AN OFFICER, A | AGENT OR EN | IPLOYEE OF THE U.S. | YES A PAF | □ RTY? | NO | X | | |
| | | | | | | YES | | NO | X | | |
| . 1 | S THIS C. 88 USC §2 | ASE REC 2284? | UIRED TO BE HEARD | O AND DETER | MINED BY A DISTRICT | COU | RT OF | THREE JUI | OGES PURS | UANT | TO TITLE |
| | | | | | | YES | | NO | X | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | THE |
| . C | O ALL O OMMON AME DIV | F THE PA WEALTH ISION? - | ARTIES IN THIS ACTION OF MASSACHUSETT (SEE LOCAL RULE 4 | ON, EXCLUDI 'S ("GOVERN 10.1(D)). | NG GOVERNMENTAL MENTAL AGENCIES"), | AGEN | CIES (DING | OF THE UNI IN MASSAC | TED STATES HUSETTS R | S AND ESIDE | IN THE |
| S | O <u>ALL</u> O OMMON' AME DIV | F THE PA WEALTH ISION? - | ARTIES IN THIS ACTION OF MASSACHUSETT (SEE LOCAL RULE 4 | ON, EXCLUDI S ("GOVERN 10.1(D)). | | AGENO RESI YES | CIES C DING X | OF THE UNI IN MASSAC NO | TED STATES HUSETTS R | S AND ESIDE | IN THE |
| S | OO <u>ALL</u> O OMMON AME DIV | 151UN ? - | (SEE LOCAL RULE 4 | l0.1(D)). | | YES | X | NO | HUSETTS R | S AND ESIDE | IN THE |
| S | WHE DIA | . 1310N?- | (SEE LOCAL RULE 4 | l0.1(D)). | | YES RNMEN | X | NO PARTIES RE | SIDE? | ESIDE | IN THE |
| . D | WHE DIA | . | (SEE LOCAL RULE 4 F YES, IN WHICH DIV EASTERN DIVISION F NO, IN WHICH DIVIS | /ISION DO AL | L OF THE NON-GOVER | YES RNMEN | X ITAL F | NO PARTIES RE | HUSETTS R SIDE? TERN DIVISI | ESIDE | IN THE |
| | AME DIV | . . . | F YES, IN WHICH DIVENSION F NO, IN WHICH DIVISOR F NO, IN WHICH DIVISOR FOVERNMENTAL AGE | /ISION DO AL | L OF THE NON-GOVER | YES RNMEN LAINTI | X ITAL F | NO PARTIES RE WEST R THE ONL | HUSETTS R SIDE? TERN DIVISI | ON EXCL | IN THE |
| .EA | B SE TYPE | . I | (SEE LOCAL RULE 4 F YES, IN WHICH DIVISION F NO, IN WHICH DIVIS GOVERNMENTAL AGE FASTERN DIVISION | (0.1(D)). VISION DO AL X SION DO THE ENCIES, RES | L OF THE NON-GOVER CENTRAL DIVISION MAJORITY OF THE PERIONE IN MASSACHUS | YES RNMEN LAINTI | X ITAL F | NO PARTIES RE WEST R THE ONL | HUSETTS R SIDE? TERN DIVISI Y PARTIES, | ON EXCL | UDING |
| .EA | B SE TYPE | . I | F YES, IN WHICH DIVENSION F NO, IN WHICH DIVISOR F NO, IN WHICH DIVISOR FOVERNMENTAL AGE | (0.1(D)). VISION DO AL X SION DO THE ENCIES, RES | L OF THE NON-GOVER CENTRAL DIVISION MAJORITY OF THE PERIONE IN MASSACHUS | YES RNMEN LAINTI | X ITAL F | NO PARTIES RE WEST R THE ONL | HUSETTS R SIDE? TERN DIVISI Y PARTIES, | ON EXCL | UDING |
| LEA TO! DRI | B SE TYPE RNEY'S N | OR PRIN | F YES, IN WHICH DIVENTED IN WHICH DIVISION F NO, IN WHICH DIVISION GOVERNMENTAL AGE GASTERN DIVISION IT) MALA M. RAFIK | (IO.1(D)). VISION DO AL X SION DO THE ENCIES, RES | L OF THE NON-GOVER CENTRAL DIVISION MAJORITY OF THE PERIONE IN MASSACHUS | YES RNMEN I D LAINTI | X STAL F FFS O RESID | NO PARTIES RE WEST R THE ONL DE? WEST | HUSETTS R SIDE? TERN DIVISI Y PARTIES, | ON EXCL | UDING |